DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 693 EA 012 812

AUTHOR Karst, Ralph R.
TITLE What Can and Should Be Sources of Information for Research on Professional Development and Inservice Programs for Educators?
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 23p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the NCSIE (Fort Lauderdale, FL, November 1979). Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research: *Inservice Teacher Education: Literature Reviews: *Organizational Theories

ABSTRACT

The continual development of a body of knowledge about inservice education requires attention to data collection, conceptual clarity, and the need for a self-correcting theory through which research proceeds. This paper is divided into four separate discussions: (1) the difficulties of developing a clear concept of career education, (2) minimal specifications necessary for developing theoretical structures, (3) the ingredients of data collection for preparing professional educators, and (4) the role of policymakers and the effects of organizational change. The paper concludes that the best arrangement between individuals and organizations is the one in which there is reciprocation of satisfaction and self-fulfillment. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R R Karst
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED189693

EA 012 812

What Can and Should Be Sources of Information for Research on Professional Development and Inservice Programs for Educators? *

Ralph R. Karst, PhD
St. John's University
Jamaica, New York

(Introductory Note: When I was given the task of answering this question my first thoughts sped to measurement problems and discussions of theoretical frameworks because my background included measurement and research. However, as I reviewed some of the literature on inservice education I soon realized that I had to take one step backward and look at the problem in broader philosophical terms, as it seemed to me that my knowledge and experience in organizational theory, and as an assistant professor in educational administration, constantly led me to consider more fundamental issues of importance for research on the problem of career education. So I decided to take an organizational approach and attempt to define the necessary "sources of information" in categorical terms, that is, to talk about important issues connected with it--difficulties with the concept of career education when reciprocal to theory, the realization that all the sophisticated data collection and retrieval methods needed are already available, and that the policy makers concerned with education are required in these times of change, both in organizational theory and in society, to more seriously consider career education as a viable alternative.)

The problem for this paper is not so much about what can and should be sources of information for research as it is about some of the more fundamental parameters of an extensive organizational problem. It seems, to me, to be more of an organizational problem perhaps because the field is relatively new to me and maybe I fail to realize how far inservice education has come. But after all, individuals grow professionally only within the sanctioned boundaries of the organizations that support them, though much of the literature I reviewed seemed to be saying that individuals are primarily responsible for their own self-regeneration. And it has to be admitted that exactly how much individuals and how much organizations decide their

*Invited paper presented at the NCSIE National Workshop at Fort Lauderdale, Florida, November, 1979.

separate contributions will always be matters of philosophy and religion and not organizational theory (Barnard, 1938).

I presume no final answers, and my paper is not an attempt to project everything that can be said about the topic. It is a philosophical perspective on career education in light of the fact that insights and information about organizational problems are prerequisites for the possibilities of developing a scientific body of knowledge. Though I must add that it is possible that those things that I shall touch upon have already been thoroughly considered in literature that I failed to cover. One would hope that such is not the case and that what I have to say will provide you with information you might not have thought about before, and if that proves the case then I shall feel my efforts have been rewarded.

The major thrust of the paper extends to a consideration of information that provides for the realization of appropriate theory building for career education. The sources of this information include the following factors, and these factors constitute the main body of my remarks: (1) an idea of the difficulties in developing a clear concept of career education; (2) minimal specifications necessary for developing theoretical structures; (3) the ingredients of data collection for preparing professional educators; (4) the role of the policymakers and the effects of organizational change; and (5) summary remarks.

The Conceptual Problem

When we know with absolute certainty that there can be no doubts about the meaning of an idea it is called a concept (Berlin, 1978). Thus a concept is very clear and known to all; it is a

tool that reflects measured reality and thus is the sole means for creating a scientific body of knowledge. Without clear concepts there can be no theory and therefore no discipline (Griffiths, 1975). And if we are talking about research in the broad discipline of inservice education, then conceptual clarity is the primary element for building the discipline. But after reviewing the literature this is exactly what I didn't find. There existed no clear and concise concept of inservice education.

I found that there were a number of ways in which inservice education was defined. A summary review by Gaff, Festa, and Gaff (1978) indicated that many research studies have been done on inservice education, but little conceptual clarity was evident to me. Review of several studies suggested that such terms as inservice education, staff and faculty development, career education, and professional education development seemed integral with the same phenomena, but with varying degrees of breadth and depth. For example, some writers on the subject defined inservice education as "professional development of specific teaching improvements" (Mayhew, pp. 158-167, 1977). Others maintained that it dealt with program and curriculum improvements among personal and organizational categories (Bergquist and Phillips, 1975). A few restricted the meaning exclusively to preservice education, as though inservice education was preservice education, which could lead someone to conclude that perhaps practicing teachers were not capable of learning. Some attempted to define it as "improving classroom methodologies."

Edelfelt (1974) agreed that definitional compromise may facilitate progress once the concept of inservice education has been clarified. Yet Edelfelt confused organizational processes, such as the teacher center concept, minicourses, inservice modules, with efforts to clarify the concept itself:

> The point in citing alternative approaches is that there are several valid concepts of inservice education and that it will take more than one concept to satisfy the vested interests of all parties involved. (p. 252)

On the other hand, Comras and Masterman (1972) clearly distinguished the difference between inservice education as a method or program and inservice education as a concept. They defined it as "total professional growth" in a variety of opportunities provided by planned organizational structure.

Thus, the problem of conceptual clarity, as I saw it from examining some of the literature, seemed related to confusion about means and ends. There were several valid <u>programs</u> described, but these are not the end, an all-encompassing goal with capacity to become a concept that leads to a theory which resolves the broadest and most general features of processes and means (Suppes, 1974).

The work by Comras and Masterman seemed to come closest to my own perception. Few writers could be found who viewed the concept in broad philosophical language or attempted to come up with a singular concept with potential for establishing the needed theoretical framework. My own hypothesis will be described later. For now I want to continue my review on conceptual clarification.

Another confounding issue is the way in which inservice

education was treated as though school teachers and college professors were different. In my opinion, only what is emphasized is different not the philosophical goal of it. But there were studies that concluded differently. Some writers defined inservice education as "the continual pursuit of advanced degrees." Logically then this would exclude all teachers and professors with the terminal degree, and thus seems unacceptable. Cochran (1975) held the view that if all it amounted to was degree-granting it would be inadequate because it could not account for what happens after the final degree had been earned. Cochran further believed that the main fault was the artificial barrier that existed between school teachers and their college professors. It was the college professors who were responsible because they seemed to have "demonstrated an extremely low level of support for career education." (p. 6, 1975)

To examine the full extent of Cochran's perception would be too much of a task here, for it warrants comprehensive research that more specifically establishes professorial attitides and beliefs. Generally, however, part of the problem is the fact that college professors have more freedom to pursue their scholarly interests, and there is the presumption that they should be more responsible for their own professional renewal--though this is quite unfounded (Richmond and Farmer, 1976; Milton, et al., 1978; The Group for Human Development in Higher Education, 1974). College professors experience the same problems of "burn-out,""drop-out," "cop-out," as anyone else. They are no special case, because like anyone else, they still must discover the secret to sustained vitality and interest

in what they are doing. And no one can do this alone. At the conclusion of my paper I will tell you a little story that demonstrates what I mean in the deepest philosophical sense.

Lastly, there are a few other issues related to the problem of conceptual clarity. Foremost among these seemed to be an observation made by Bentley (1972) that a real problem was"some teachers wanted to become involved with programs designed to help them improve and others did not." Meaning, "you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink." There is a good deal to the powers of persuasion--whether in the public schools or in higher education.

Another problem was the factor of "genuine motivation." Some writers claimed that the original idea for inservice seemed to come from local school districts and administrators who believed that advanced degree work forced teachers to improve themselves professionally. And for several decades we have heard the stories that education is the vehicle for social ascension;and,if you can't be anything else you can always be a teacher; and, teachers make good money. All of these myths have turned attention away from genuine development and motivation to matters of social status and economics (Gorman and Hamilton, p. 20, 1975).

If the concept of inservice education is perceived as a tool of evaluation or performance-based there are also confounding problems. Evaluation can be used as a constructive statement or as a weapon. And those who apply it are not immune from mistakes. How many Type I or Type II errors an administrator makes is strictly a

function of institutional characteristics. A study done a few years ago suggested that professional education development is a reciprocal function between individuals and the organizations of which they are a part (Karst, 1971). This meant that career education as a concept is essentially an organizational problem.

In conclusion to this section, if research on inservice education is to contribute to the creation of inservice education as a discipline and body of knowledge, then the problem of conceptual clarity must be resolved so that the theoretical foundations can be built. And it is my belief that the primary concept should be philosophically comprehensive in essential meaning.

My hypothesis was based on the literature that I examined in inservice education, and also on my broader familiarity with organizational studies and theory. It would be impossible for me to describe the organizational literature within my time-frame now. That is something for the future. But I do feel obligated to present my own idea on what the essential meaning of the inservice concept ought to be, namely:

> that of professional education development in which organizational satisfaction and personal self-fulfillment represent the central concept.

Organizational satisfaction refers to those processes through which the individual finds a place in the organization and has genuine loyalty toward that organization and is happy with the reciprocal relationship. Personal self-fulfillment refers to doing what one likes to do, and doing it well over a sustained period of time, for a life-time. Each element of the concept cannot exist without

the other. They are inter-dependent variables. And it should be remembered that this is only my own hypothesis, though much of it is based in research on organizations. Like anything else it is subject to empirical test and scientific verification. As the concept that represents clarity and primary status it remains to be proven. In view of the literature on inservice my hypothesis is a very long distance from the status of generality and universally accepted truth.

Minimal Specifications for Theory

The main features of my discussion of the conceptual problem are also some of the minimal specifications for theory. These include: (1) development and improvement that eliminates the traditional separation of teachers by educational level or type; (2) an information and data collection system that includes all professionals in the teaching-learning setting--staff, faculty, and administration; (3) an organizational fabric that includes organizational factors, particularly those related to policy formulation and organizational planning; (4) a concept of continuity and integration of people and organizations through the hypothesis of organizational satisfaction and personal self-fulfillment; and (5) evolvement of conceptual clarity and theoretical foundations for career education so that a self-correcting body of knowledge can grow.

The question of theory deserves some additional attention, as does a brief discussion of measurement, since both of these topics also include minimum specifications for theory.

As I have said before, theory is vital to the establishment of a body of knowledge. Far too many studies reviewed were unrelated in definition, procedures, and in philosophy. This makes it very difficult for scientific generation of theory through conceptual developments and models.

Briefly, a theory must have structural depth supported by statistically sound measurement tools, provide for greater richness for itself, that is, be self-correcting, and have a potential for subsequent developments that did not exist before (Suppes, 1974; Griffiths, 1975; Stone, 1978; Berlin, 1978). It goes beyond mere empirical study and extends to the broader problem of search for the general features of a process. Empirical studies require conceptual unity among themselves, but even this cannot produce theory because empiricism cannot provide for prediction and analysis, which means it cannot generalize (Suppes, 1974; Berlin, 1978).

Further, my review of some of the literature, though not all, indicated to me that career education lacked the needed singular philosophical statement. And as I have said, my own hypothesis certainly lacks conceptual clarity. It has the status of being no different from the vague feelings of theory about flight before the Wright brothers deduced the answer from experimentation.

The question of existence and reality are at the very heart of concept clarity. When something is real it has validity and reliability. But at this time I cannot go into any detail on measurement theory and quantitative instrumentation. It is a topic unto itself. I can only briefly bring it up in light of my review of literature which apparently indicated a laxity of serious concern

for the validity and reliability of measurement and evaluation tools used in inservice education.

Measurement is a very serious business, and anytime someone says they have a measurement device it had better have been thoroughly field tested and statistically proven fit for measurement. In fact, measurement theory itself can become powerfully intrusive, and original research questions can be lost (Kerlinger, pp. 411-462, 1966). For example, Kerlinger described a measurement expert who had been transformed from being a researcher. It seems this researcher began to pilot test the instrument---and kept on pilot testing it; more than a dozen times over a ten year period he piloted and always did factor analysis and never got the statistical adequacy necessary for meaningful findings. Conceptual verification identifies reality, and reality is often abstract and hard to measure.

Developing disciplines usually produce measurement books, but I found no books in inservice education that dealt specifically with the measurement of career education. If none indeed exists then it is something whose time has come. Obviously there are many measurement books available across many disciplines. Often the scientific status of a discipline can be measured by the number of quality measurement books it has. In my own search for good books, one that comes close to career education was the book by Stone (1978) and it dealt specifically with the measurement of organizational structures and functions.

In addition to those minimal specifications already stated the following factors conclude this section:

1. More comparative studies need to be done within the same project that compares and measures with validated instruments

a great variety of samples in different populations at all levels of education and in all disciplines.

2. Developments in measurement. Measurement tools should have more general applications, which means more extensive pilot work, and all findings in the field should always include statements of validity and reliability.

3. Reviews of literature and conclusions of studies should attempt to do a better job at linking one study with another. Attempts should be made to theory build and to develop a sense for the meaning of conceptual clarity and continuity of results.

Some Ingredients of Data Collection

It is important to note that it took five decades of sophisticated developments of concepts and theory to bring teacher education to its current level of skills and attitudes. Within these developments technology has kept pace and has been utilized by organizational planners and policymakers for more accurate and more efficient means for keeping records, storing data, and devising beautifully run retrieval systems. In addition, the past 10 years has seen the emergence of code books that technocrats of education use for recording data at all levels of education and covering all phases of the vast national educational enterprise. State Departments of Education and the several federal agencies involved with Education have worked on these code books. For example, the WICHE organization (Western Interstate Council on Higher Education) has developed an enormous code book covering tens of thousands of concepts converted to an intricate numbering system that can be computerized. Users of the WICHE code book gain access to enormous amounts of information and have expanded greatly the extent of their knowledge.

The way in which educational theory has developed and the manner in which technology has expanded the abilities and expectations of educators has been impressive to any educated foreigner visiting our country. But if my feeling for the literature I reviewed in preparation for this paper is true, then it will require another five decades to expand the theory of learning beyond students into the complicated question of how teachers learn.

What I am getting at here, to make a long story short, is that we have the technology. the ideologies, and the methodologies behind us, and they all can be pragmatically applied to extend the skills and attitudes of teachers at all levels of education and in all disciplines. What is lacking in the code books are concepts covering career education. When such concepts are missing from the code books it can only mean that the policymakers and educational planners do not consider these concepts as vital segments of the organizational fabric.

Initially I had planned to present an outline discussion of the planners and policymakers points of view on concepts, but time is running short and the most I can do is indicate that there are really only three basic categories of information that are required in any data system, regardless of how complicated. These are (1) the academic unit, (2) physical plant, and (3) fiscal. At some point in time policymakers will have to incorporate into the organizational structure of education those features of career education that make it integrally functional in the required network of communications.

Role of the Policymakers and Organizational Change

Throughout this paper I have emphasized the importance of research and scientific development. And if our history of theoretical success and technological developments in education over the past five decades need help in promoting the creation of the discipline of career education (professional education development) over the next five decades it most will come from the policymakers and from change, and change of the most shocking sort.

What I would like to do is describe some of the main issues surrounding organizational theory, because I personally believe that a central research problem for career education is the notion that perhaps researchers have not tied their work to an organizational theory, and thereby missing a crucial link to the policymakers of education. I could be wrong on this but it seems to me to make logical sense.

Policymaking is the heart of all organizational planning (Thompson, 1976). Policies represent the general guides for how an organization operates. And anyone who has ever been connected with the process of writing policy statements knows how frustrating it is when several conflicting philosophies vie for the primary interpretation in a document that must reflect both fact and fancy.

I think it is safe to say that at this point in time

inservice education across all levels of education is still relatively unknown. But in time I feel this will change through the many factors we have already discussed. Part of the reason, as I have said, is because learning theory has been primarily concerned with how children learn and not with how teachers learn. And we are asking for an extension of the meaning, which will lead to important changes in organizational theory. And, fortunately, organizational theory itself has changed precisely because of enormous changes in the beliefs and attitudes of people in American society.

Organizational theory has changed over the years, and has affected and has been effected by change. What I would like to do is trace briefly some significant features and then present some of the changes in society that are predicted for the next five decades. When I am finished you will see how important it is to develop career education as an integral feature of educational organization.

The theories behind how organizations are run and how they come to develop policies is a vast historical topic. The essence of it is connected with change.

From 1900 to 1930 in the public schools saw the incorporation of Max Weber's model of bureaucratic control(Callahan, 1962). It was the managerial model: a hierarchial chain of command, span of control, authority from the top, and a legalistic, objective approach using rules and regulation to govern both administrators and teachers. The same period also witnessed the emergence of Fred Taylor's scientific management research. It was used to prove that America's schools could be run efficiently. The "factory model" of schools as "production plants" was created, and we still live

with that inappropriate anomaly today. The point here is that we still are being influenced by the managerial model and its tendency to treat people "less than human." And it is a fundamental reason for the slow start of career education.

The philosophy behind the classical model of bureaucracy focused strictly on the job to be done and neglected the crucial factor of how people felt about the job to be done. There were negative reactions and new theories developed--particularly important was the socio-political model of organization. The key research was done by Mayo, who discovered that people seem to perform not in terms of the task to be done but in terms of how they perceive themselves in their own group. It was group attitude and social relations that controlled both the quantity and quality of production. In other words, people controlled production, regardless of what goals the supervisor set. It shattered the classical model and paved the way for educational reforms in education (Hanson, pp. 22-63, 1979).

At the same time, another scientist, Abraham Maslow (1954) developed his "theory of hierarchial needs." It seemed to be a direct, almost defiant, resistence against the "theory of hierarchial management." Maslow's theory put the highest needs of individuals as self-fulfillment and satisfaction; lower on the scale were physical and economic needs.

An extension of Maslow's work included "organizational reciprocity," which McGreagor (1960) called "the Y theory." It essentially attacked the X Theory (classical management model) which seemed to view teachers as impervious to change or improvement, and

educational planners and policymakers were led to believe that teachers avoided responsibility, lacked ambition to improve themselves, and were indifferent to institutional needs. All of these beliefs go back to the classical model, and of course, with the changes and developments in organizational theory, so too are views of teachers changing to something more reasonable.

Recent developments in organization theory are reflecting the rapid changes occurring in America today. Contingency theory has developed, and it has no value-orientation at all that is external to the internal problems. Another is called "open systems" in which hierarchies are replaced by inter-locking cycles of events within and between systems (Katz and Kahn, 1966). Both theories provided teachers with opportunities to be creative and flexible, even in changing environments, and particularly in environments that are boring and devoid of vitality. It would seem fair to say that these newer theories, with their emphases on situations and confrontation gave rise to "teacher power" (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Webber, 1975).

My final comments include talk about what's happening today and what may happen tomorrow. If career education means anything at all it means adaptability and readiness for the changes in values that lie ahead. And it means willingness to defend and protect what is worthy of defense on the battleground of values.

Much has happened. There are local, state, and federal programs of education; there are title programs; problems with the U. S. Constitution and the Amendments; the increased involvement of the

U.S. Supreme Court in educational matters; student problems--with riots, discipline, drugs, and sex; faculty strikes; collective bargaining; explosion of law suits against educators; public confrontations and violence surrounding school issues.

All of these things make one wonder what is going to happen in the future if things like these continue to occur. The practical results of this wondering were the development of the "change-agents" in the schools and the "futurists." Future shock is a possibility that has already been predicted for our society. It predicts that people who fail to adjust to the coming new society will be left out of it (Toffler, 1970).

And we have in education our own futurist, Debenham (1973) who made remarkable and indeed shocking predictions that theorists in career education, in policymaking, and over-all educational planning had better heed. Debenham claims that everything he predicts already has its roots in existing society. Here are a few examples taken from his book:

1. Genetic engineering education in which specialized mutants are trained by coaches to do all our necessary hard and dangerous work.
2. Supersleep Centers: these will be housed in school facilities; individuals electronically get their needed sleep for each 24 hours in less than one hour; it means massive expansion of curricular offerings.
3. Personality and intelligence drugs and implants. these will have a profound effect upon the kinds of students and teachers in the teaching-learning environment; implants and brain chips force us to think differently because knowledge and attitudes can be piped instantly and directly into the brain.
4. Superfood Education: one meal a month eliminates kitchens in the home and from schools; home economics becomes an historical academic subject.
5. Education orgasms: these are electrode implants that reward rapid accurate learning through the pleasure centers of the body.
6. Participatory democracy: schools are centers for data presentation of issues and facts involving politics; models and events of likely occurrence are projected and alternatives on referendums are

shown on the school's giant screen on a nightly basis; there are no representatives, only appointed technocrats who provide citizens with the issues for the vote

Of course, these predictions are quite shocking, and I don't believe any of us <u>really</u> believe they will happen. But isn't history like that? People don't believe until it happens.

Summary Remarks

We started off with some broad philosophical statements about the connection between individuals and the organizations to which they belong. I said that how much each gives are matters of philosophy and religion, but as I developed my paper I came to realize that it is an organizational problem that is being worked on every day in our schools, colleges, and universities. So I developed my paper from an organizational point of view.

I indicated that more than philosophy and religion are required for the continual development of a body of knowledge for inservice education (and we used many various terms for what we called inservice education.) This continual development requires attention to data collection, conceptual clarity, and the need for a self-correcting theory through which research proceeds. At this point we talked some about what a theory is and means in general outline. And we excluded more than we included.

I also offered you my own hypothesis which was that the best arrangement between individuals and organizations is the one in which there is reciprocation of satisfaction and self-fulfillment, and I assumed that the organization may be slightly more important

than the individual, though how much more I don't know. But my hypothesis was not just pure guess. It was based on philosophy and on some scientific research. It could be wrong, but to be wrong it has to be proven wrong.

Lastly, we covered some organizational theory because I personally believe that researchers of career education have more to do in connecting their work to some organizational theory, or to any theory. I also believe that because of the way education has been organized has, at least to some degree, caused neglect of inservice education by educational planners and policymakers.

I closed with a brief listing of some things that are predicted for education, and though I realize none of us actually believes these things will occur, I personally feel we shouldn't ignore their roots in connection with education. If anything, such predictions should mobilize us in education to sort out those values that are worthy of our best defense and protection.

I believe that policymakers are aware that great changes are occurring in our society, and through the help of educational theory (continually self-corrected through sustained experimentation and research) and continual development of career education concepts, the future of American education rests in the hands of educators aggressively and vitally interested in their work and who have the highest ethical standards on earth. Thank you.

Oh yes, about the little story I promised you...

References

Barnard, Chester. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Bentley, Ernest. "Comprehensive Staff Development." THEORY INTO PRACTICE. Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 262-266, 1972.

Bergquist, W. and Phillips, S. "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program." JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION. Vol. 46, pp. 177-211, 1975.

Bowles, D. B. "Nature and Relationships of Concepts, Theory, and Research." Madison: University of Wisconsin Department of Educational Administration, (undated.)

Callahan, Raymond. EDUCATION AND THE CULT OF EFFICIENCY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Cochran, Lesle. "Inservice Education: Passive-Complacant-Reality." THEORY INTO PRACTICE. Vol. 14, No.1, pp. 5-10, 1975.

Comras, J. and Masterman, R. "A Rationale for Comprehensive Inservice Programs." THE CLEARING HOUSE. pp. 424-426, March, 1972.

Debenham, Jerry. SAFE: A Computerized Simulation-Game of Alternative Futures for American Education from 1975 Through 2024, A. D. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, Cultural Foundations of Education, June, 1973.

Dillon, Betty. "Innovation and Collaboration- A Public School Educator Speaks." JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION. Vol. 25, No. 3, Summer, pp. 256-257, 1974.

Edelfelt, Roy. "Inservice Education of Teachers." JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION. Vol. 25, No. 3, Summer, pp. 250-252, 1974.

Elam, Stanley. PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION: WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE ART? Washington, D. C., American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, December, 1971.

Finder, Morris. "Evaluating and Liberating Teaching and Teachers." THE ENGLISH RECORD, pp. 11-13, Spring, 1975.

Gaff, S., Festa, C., and Gaff, J. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT- A GUIDE TO RESOURCES. New York: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Garte, S. and Rosenblum, M. "Lighting Fires in Burned Out Counselors." PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE JOURNAL. Vol. 57, No. 3, PP. 158-160, November, 1978.

German, L. and Hamilton, J. "Performance/Competency Based Inservice Teacher Education." THEORY INTO PRACTICE. Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 20-26, 1975.

Griffiths, Daniel. "Some Thoughts About Theory in Educational Administration." UCEA REVIEW. Vol. 17, No. 1, 1975.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN A TIME OF RETRENCHMENT. New York: Change Magazine Publications, 1974.

Hanson, E. M. EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL THOUGHT. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979.

Karst, Ralph R. "The Reciprocal Nature of Accountability." NEBRASKA JOURNAL FOR HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION. February, 1971.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF ORGANIZATIONS. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Kerlinger, F. FOUNDATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, pp. 411-462, 1966.

Lawrence, P. and Lorsch, J. ORGANIZATION AND ENVIRONMENT: MANAGEMENT DIFFERENTIATION AND INTEGRATION. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, 1967.

Maslow, A. MOTIVATION AND PERSONALITY. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Mayhew, Lewis. LEGACY OF THE SEVENTIES. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

McGreagor, Douglas. THE HUMAN SIDE OF ENTERPRISE. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Milton, et al. ON COLLEGE TEACHING. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Richman, B. and Farmer, R. LEADERSHIP, GOALS, AND POWER IN HIGHER EDUCATION. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 258-274, 1976.

Stone, Eugene. RESEARCH METHODS IN ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR. Santa Monica: Goodyear Publishing, 1978.

Taylor, Fred. THE PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT. New York: Harpers, 1923.

Thompson, John. POLICYMAKING IN AMERICAN PUBLIC EDUCATION. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Toffler, Alvin. FUTURE SHOCK. New York: Random House, 1970.

Van Auken, Steven. "Youth Counselor Burnout." PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE JOURNAL. Vol. 58, No. 2, October, 1979.

Warnath, C. and Shelton, J. "The Ultimate Disappointment: The Burned-Out Counselor. PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE JOURNAL, Vol. 55, pp. 172-195, 1976.

Webber, Ross. MANAGEMENT: BASIC ELEMENTS OF MANAGERIAL ORGANIZATIONS. Homewood: Irwin, 1975.

Weber, Max. THE THEORY OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION. (Edited by Talcott Parsons) New York: Free Press, 1964.

Willower, Donald. "Theory in Educational Administration." UCEA REVIEW. Vol. 16, No. 5, pp. 2-10, 1975.